



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/883,300	06/19/2001	Glenn J. Boysko	53470.003028	9721
21967 7590 04/26/2011 HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT 1900 K STREET, N.W. SUITE 1200 WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1109				
EXAMINER NGUYEN, THU HA T				
ART UNIT 2453		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 04/26/2011		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

09/883,300

Applicant(s)

BOYSKO ET AL.

Examiner

THU HA T. NGUYEN

Art Unit

2453

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 February 2011.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/C2.06)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims **1-20** are presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed February 14, 2011 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because of the following reasons:

3. Applicant argues that Win does not teach or disclose "pass-through authentication" or "anonymous authentication".

4. In response to applicant's argument, the examiner submits that Win does teach pass-through authentication (col. 6, line 10-col. 7, line 6, col. 12, line 10-53 –*Registry server using Authentication server module to authenticate user via Registry Repository (i.e., database)*, and anonymous authentication (col. 8, line 5-col. 9, line 12 –*Authenticate and permit user to access to certain source based on user role*).

5. Applicant argues that Win does not teach Open Database Connectivity (ODBC) which described in the specification as a method of communicating with databases or database servers and Win simply does not even suggest such communication in its system.

6. In response to applicant's argument, the examiner asserts that Win does teach this feature as shown in figures 1, 3, 5, col. 6, lines 41-col. 7, line 67 –*the access server 106 authenticates/verifies user name/password with Registry sever 108*).

7. Applicant argues that Win does not teach any type of On-Line Analytical processing (OLAP) decision support system (DSS), and a plurality of

Art Unit: 2453

authentication processes comprising a standard-node authentication, pass-through authentication, and anonymous authentication, and applying the authentication process to authenticate the user against remote repository using Open Database Connectivity (ODBC). Applicant also argues that Hellbusch fails to teach these features.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

8. Applicant argues that the combination based on hindsight reasoning.

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

9. Applicant argues that Win reference teaches away from a combination with Hellbusch.

10. In response to applicant's argument, the examiner asserts that Win teaches a method and system for secure sign-on gives a user access to authorized Web resources based on user's information (see abstract). Hellbusch provides a federated system that interconnects applications of multiple companies called Enterlink which provides security services are the key to the viability of the Enterlink to enable private and integrated applications together into an overall federated system (see col. 15, lines 45-57). Thus, Win in combination with Hellbusch to provide a security system to access resources.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action: (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made. 6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows: 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art. 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue. 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art. 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

12. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over **Win et al.** (hereinafter Win) U.S. Patent No. **6,453,353**, in view of **Hellbusch et al.** (Hellbusch) U.S. Patent No. **7,231,433**.

13. As to claim 1, Win teaches the invention as claimed, including a method for integrating security and user account data in a reporting system with at least one remote repository comprising the steps of:

enabling a user to submit user credential input to a reporting system (figure 1, col. 5, lines 12-20, col. 6, lines 20-40 –*receiving user registers/log-in to the system/central repository/registry repository at a registry server*);

identifying an authentication process (figure 1, col. 6, lines 41-col. 7, line 6) from a plurality of authentication process comprising a standard-mode authentication (fig. 5A, col. 9, lines 41-60), pass-through authentication (col. 6, line 10-col. 7, line 6, col. 12, line 10-53 –*Registry server using Authentication server module to authenticate user via Registry Repository (i.e., database)*, and anonymous authentication (col. 8, line 5-col. 9, line 12 –*Authenticate and permit user to access to certain source based on user role*);

forwarding the user credential input to a first server (figures 1, 3, 5, col. 8, line 5-col. 10, line 33 –*forwarding to access server 106 for authentication*); and

enabling the first server to apply the authentication process to authenticate the user against a remote repository using Open Database Connectivity (ODBC) (*i.e., Register Repository*) for verifying the user credential input (figures 1, 3, 5,

Art Unit: 2453

col. 6, lines 41-col. 7, line 67 –*the access server 106 authenticates/verifies user name/password with Registry sever 108*) and to determine user access control data for identifying at least one user privilege for performing one or more actions and at least one user permission associated with one or more objects (abstract, col. 5, line 66-col. 6, line 17, col. 8, lines 5-23, col. 11, lines 42-64 –*providing user a personalized menu that displays only resources that user has a right to access according to user's profile, including user's role and privileges*), wherein the remote repository is located within a second server, the second server being different from the first server (figure 1, col. 6, lines 20-26 and 41-54 – *the registry repository 110 at the registry server 108 that stores user information, resources, users' role that can be used by access server 106 to authorize user's privileges and wherein the access server 106 and registry server 108 are different*).

However, Win does not explicitly teach wherein the reporting system comprises an On-Line Analytical Processing (OLAP) decision support system (DSS).

Hellbusch teaches the reporting system comprises an On-Line Analytical Processing (OLAP) decision support system (DSS) (col. 5, lines 26-37).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teachings of Win to include OLAP decision support system as disclosed by Hellbusch in order to provide a useful architecture that interconnects applications of multiple enterprises into a single federated system.

14. As to claim 2, Win teaches the invention as claimed, further comprising a step of importing user information from the remote repository (figure 1, col. 5, lines 12-20, col. 6, lines 20-26, col. 7, lines 45-57).

15. As to claim 3, Win teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the authentication process comprises Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (col. 12, lines 10-53).

16. As to claim 4, Win teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the authentication process comprises an operating system authentication (figures 1, 3, 5, col. 6, lines 41-col. 7, line 67).

17. As to claim 5, Win teaches the invention as claimed, further comprising a step of enabling the server to synchronize user account data with the user information from the remote repository (col. 7, lines 34-67, col. 19, line 50-col. 20, line 53).

18. As to claim 6, Win teaches wherein the user is associated with a group of users wherein group information from the remote repository is imported (figure 1, col. 5, lines 12-20, col. 6, lines 20-26, col. 7, lines 45-57).

19. As to claim 7, Win teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the user information comprises at least one or user permissions, privileges and

Art Unit: 2453

access rights associated with the user (abstract, col. 5, line 66-col. 6, line 17, col. 8, lines 5-23, col. 11, lines 42-64).

20. As to claim 8, Win teaches the invention as claimed, including a system for integrating security and user account data in a reporting system with at least one remote repository, comprising:

an input for enabling a user to submit user credential input to a reporting system (figure 1, col. 5, lines 12-20, col. 6, lines 20-40 –*receiving user registers/log-in to the system/central repository*);

an identification module for identifying an authentication process (figure 1, col. 6, lines 41-col. 7, line 6) from a plurality of authentication process comprising a standard-mode authentication (fig. 5A, col. 9, lines 41-60), pass-through authentication (col. 6, line 10-col. 7, line 6, col. 12, line 10-53 –*Registry server using Authentication server module to authenticate user via Registry Repository (i.e., database)*, and anonymous authentication (col. 8, line 5-col. 9, line 12 – *Authenticate and permit user to access to certain source based on user role*);

a forwarding module for forwarding the user credential input to a first server (figures 1, 3, 5, col. 8, line 5-col. 10, line 33 –*forwarding to access server 106 for authentication*); and

a first server for applying the authentication process to authenticate the user against a remote repository using Open Database Connectivity (ODBC) (*i.e., Register Repository*) for verifying the user credential input (figures 1, 3, 5, col. 6, lines 41-col. 7, line 67 –*the access server 106 authenticates/verifies user*

name/password with Registry sever 108) and to determine user access control data for identifying at least one user privilege for performing one or more actions and at least one user permission associated with one or more objects (abstract, col. 5, line 66-col. 6, line 17, col. 8, lines 5-23, col. 11, lines 42-64 –*providing user a personalized menu that displays only resources that user has a right to access according to user's profile, including user's role and privileges*), wherein the remote repository is located within a second server, the second server being different from the first server (figure 1, col. 6, lines 20-26 and 41-54 – *the registry repository 110 at the registry server 108 that stores user information, resources, users' role that can be used by access server 106 to authorize user's privileges and wherein the access server 106 and registry server 108 are different*).

However, Win does not explicitly teach wherein the reporting system comprises an On-Line Analytical Processing (OLAP) decision support system (DSS).

Hellbusch teaches the reporting system comprises an On-Line Analytical Processing (OLAP) decision support system (DSS) (col. 5, lines 26-37).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teachings of Win to include OLAP decision support system as disclosed by Hellbusch in order to provide a useful architecture that interconnects applications of multiple enterprises into a single federated system.

Art Unit: 2453

21. As to claim 9, Win teaches the invention as claimed, further comprising an import module for importing user information from the remote repository (figure 1, col. 5, lines 12-20, col. 6, lines 20-26, col. 7, lines 45-57).

22. As to claim 10, Win teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the authentication process comprises Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (col. 12, lines 10-53).

23. As to claim 11, Win teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the authentication process comprises an operating system authentication (figures 1, 3, 5, col. 6, lines 41-col. 7, line 67).

24. As to claim 12, Win teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the server synchronizes user account data with the user information from the remote repository (col. 7, lines 34-67, col. 19, line 50-col. 20, line 53).

25. As to claim 13, Win teaches wherein the user is associated with a group of users wherein group information from the remote repository is imported (figure 1, col. 5, lines 12-20, col. 6, lines 20-26, col. 7, lines 45-57).

26. As to claim 14, Win teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the user information comprises at least one or user permissions, privileges and

Art Unit: 2453

access rights associated with the user (abstract, col. 5, line 66-col. 6, line 17, col. 8, lines 5-23, col. 11, lines 42-64).

27. As to claim 15, Win teaches the invention as claimed, including a non-transitory processor-readable medium comprising instructions for execution by a processor to integrate security and user account data in a reporting system with at least one remote repository, the medium comprising:

instructions for causing a processor to enable a user to submit user credential input to a reporting system (figure 1, col. 5, lines 12-20, col. 6, lines 20-40 –*receiving user registers/log-in to the system/central repository*);

instructions for causing a processor to identify an authentication process (figure 1, col. 6, lines 41-col. 7, line 6) from a plurality of authentication process comprising a standard-mode authentication (fig. 5A, col. 9, lines 41-60), pass-through authentication (col. 6, line 10-col. 7, line 6, col. 12, line 10-53 –*Registry server using Authentication server module to authenticate user via Registry Repository (i.e., database)*), and anonymous authentication (col. 8, line 5-col. 9, line 12 –*Authenticate and permit user to access to certain source based on user role*);

instructions for causing a processor to forward the user credential input to a first server (figures 1, 3, 5, col. 8, line 5-col. 10, line 33 –*forwarding to access server 106 for authentication*); and

instructions for causing a processor to enable the first server to apply the authentication process to authenticate the user against a remote repository using

Art Unit: 2453

Open Database Connectivity (ODBC) (*i.e.*, *Register Repository*) for verifying the user credential input (figures 1, 3, 5, col. 6, lines 41-col. 7, line 67 –*the access server 106 authenticates/verifies user name/password with Registry sever 108*) and to determine user access control data for identifying at least one user privilege for performing one or more actions and at least one user permission associated with one or more objects (abstract, col. 5, line 66-col. 6, line 17, col. 8, lines 5-23, col. 11, lines 42-64 –*providing user a personalized menu that displays only resources that user has a right to access according to user's profile, including user's role and privileges*), wherein the remote repository is located within a second server, the second server being different from the first server (figure 1, col. 6, lines 20-26 and 41-54 – *the registry repository 110 at the registry server 108 that stores user information, resources, users' role that can be used by access server 106 to authorize user's privileges and wherein the access server 106 and registry server 108 are different*).

However, Win does not explicitly teach wherein the reporting system comprises an On-Line Analytical Processing (OLAP) decision support system (DSS).

Hellbusch teaches the reporting system comprises an On-Line Analytical Processing (OLAP) decision support system (DSS) (col. 5, lines 26-37).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teachings of Win to include OLAP decision support system as disclosed by Hellbusch in order to

Art Unit: 2453

provide a useful architecture that interconnects applications of multiple enterprises into a single federated system.

28. As to claim 16, Win teaches the invention as claimed, further comprising instructions for causing a processor to import user information from the remote repository (figure 1, col. 5, lines 12-20, col. 6, lines 20-26, col. 7, lines 45-57).

29. As to claim 17, Win teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the authentication process comprises at least one of Lightweight Directory Access Protocol and operating system authentication (col. 12, lines 10-53).

30. As to claim 18, Win teaches the invention as claimed, further comprising instructions for causing a processor to enable the server to synchronize user account data with the user information from the remote repository (col. 7, lines 34-67, col. 19, line 50-col. 20, line 53).

31. As to claim 19, Win teaches wherein the user is associated with a group of users wherein group information from the remote repository is imported (figure 1, col. 5, lines 12-20, col. 6, lines 20-26, col. 7, lines 45-57).

32. As to claim 20, Win teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the user information comprises at least one of user permissions, privileges and

Art Unit: 2453

access rights associated with the user (abstract, col. 5, line 66-col. 6, line 17, col. 8, lines 5-23, col. 11, lines 42-64).

Conclusion

33. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

34. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thu Ha Nguyen, whose telephone number is (703) 305-7447. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 8:00 AM to 6:00 PM.

35. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Krista Zele, can be reached at (571) 272-7288.

Art Unit: 2453

Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/THUHA T. NGUYEN/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2453

